DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 328 350 PS 019 363

AUTHOR Yagi, Kan
TITLE State Disadvantaged Child Project in the Portland Public Schools. 1988-89 Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION Portland Public Schools, OR. Research and Evaluation Dept.
PUB DATE Feb 90
NOTE 36p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS After School Programs; Budgets; Compensatory Education; *Disadvantaged Youth; *Economically Disadvantaged; Elementary School Students; Elementary Secondary Education; High School Students; Homework; Junior High School Students; Middle Schools; Preschool Children; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; State Programs; Tutoring
IDENTIFIERS *Portland School District OR; Program Characteristics; Project Head Start

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this report is to describe the programs that make up Oregon's Disadvantaged Child Project (DCP) and document the ways in which students benefited from participation. The DCP was established in 1967 to provide supplemental services to children in low-income and culturally deprived areas. The project contains three major components: (1) Target Area schools whose primary target populations are students in the low-income core area of a Portland District served by eight elementary schools, a middle school, and a high school; (2) Qualifying Middle schools outside the core area attended by students from the area; and (3) two special programs: a Head Start early childhood education program and an after-school tutoring and homework assistance program, both of which mainly serve students from the Portland core area. The Target Area schools served nearly 6,600 students in 10 schools. Project funds in these schools were mostly used to provide additional teachers and teacher assistants for the purpose of increasing teacher-to-student ratios, and to enrich curricula. Qualifying Middle schools served 160 students. To a great degree, services took the form of supplementary instruction in basic skills. Fall and spring achievement test results for the Target Area schools showed student achievement levels in reading, math, and language usage that were lower than district averages. (RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED328350

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

1988-89 Evaluation Report

STATE DISADVANTAGED CHILD PROJECT

IN THE PORTLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Research and Evaluation Department
Portland Public Schools
Portland, Oregon
Walter E. Hathaway, Director

Kan Yagi

February, 1990

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Kan Yagi/ Portland Pub. Sch.
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PS 019363

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ADMINISTRATIVE SUMMARY

STATE DISADVANTAGED CHILD PROJECT
1988-89

The State Disadvantaged Child Project (Project) was established in 1967. its purpose was to provide supplemental services to children residing in low income and culturally deprived areas. Since 1972 the District has provided $500,000 to the Project and the State $1 million for a combined total of $1.5 million.

The Project consisted of three major components whose primary target populations were students residing in the low income core area of the District served by eight elementary schools, one middle school, and one high school. These ten schools comprised one component referred to as "Target Area" schools. About 75 percent of the total budget was allocated to these schools.

Some students who resided in the core area, but attended middle schools outside the area comprised the second component. Three "Qualifying Middle" schools received a sufficient number of these students to receive funding. About 8.0 percent of the budget was allocated to these schools.

The third component consisted of partial support for two special programs each serving different populations. One served preschool students and the other served middle and high school students. About 12 percent of the total budget was allocated to these two programs.

In the Target Area schools, funds were used largely for instruction provided by teachers and/or aides in classrooms. A primary purpose was to reduce student/instructor ratios to more favorable proportions. Some schools also had community agents who provided others services and a liaison with homes. Conceivably, all students in the Target Area schools could benefit from more favorable student/instructor ratios and from community agent services; therefore, the total population of over 6,500 students in these schools were considered as served by the Project. Low performing students generally received more attention than others from teachers and aides; therefore, information was compiled for Chapter 1 students as a subgroup within the larger Target Area population. Chapter 1 enrollment in these schools was about 1,700.

In the three qualifying middle schools, funds were used to provide supplementary instruction in basic skills in much the same manner as Chapter 1. In addition to supplementary instruction, one school with a large number of qualifying students hired an At-Risk counselor to serve as liaison between the school and affected families. A total of 173 students were provided supplementary instruction in the Qualifying schools.

The special programs included two programs: Early Childhood Education Program (Headstart) and Whitney M. Young Learning Center (WMYLC). Headstart served about 300 preschool students in classrooms at two separate locations, and WMYLC served about 200 middle and high school students who volunteered for after-school tutoring or homework assistance. Together with the other components, a grand total of about 7,500 students were served in some way by the State Disadvantaged Child Project.

The year-end report included a description of the programs, identification of student populations, and summaries of achievement test data for Target Area and Qualifying Middle school students. Fall and spring achievement test results for the Target Area schools continued to show student achievement levels in reading, math, and language usage that were lower than district averages.

Achievement gains of Target Area students were compared to district gains in all three subjects. Differences among grade groups for 1988-89 and for the last seven years were noted; however, no pattern of consistencies were noted across grades and across years in reading and language usage. In math, however, the results showed that gains for the Target Area schools were smaller across grade levels and nearly every year. Achievement gains for Chapter 1 students were also compared to district Chapter 1 gains, and again the math gains were smaller. This finding for math is puzzling and one can only speculate at this time on the reasons for the smaller gains for the Target Area students.

Achievement gains of Project students in the Qualifying Middle schools were compared to gains of district Chapter 1 students. Although gains of the Project students tended to be smaller more often in both reading and math, the data were not sufficient to indicate definite trends.

STATE DISADVANTAGED CHILD PROJECT

EVALUATION REPORT
1988-89

Kan Yagi
Evaluation Specialist

Evaluation Department
Portland Public Schools
Portland, Oregon

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
BACKGROUND	ii
SECTION I	
Description of Programs	
Target School Programs	1
Qualifying School Programs	4
Special Programs	5
Early Childhood Education (Head Start)	5
Whitney M. Young Learning Center	6
SECTION II	
Achievements of the Project	
Target School Programs	8
Qualifying School Programs	17
Special Programs	
Early Childhood Education Centers	21
Whitney M. Young Learning Center	21
SECTION III	
Program Budget	23
SECTION IV	
Summary and Comments	25

BACKGROUND

The State Disadvantaged Child Project, begun in 1967, is a major source of supplementary funds used primarily for the basic educational needs of disadvantaged students. The State law regulating Special Education services defines these students as those who are socially or culturally deprived to the extent that without supplementary support, they would not profit as well as other students from regular school programs. Annually, since 1972 Portland Public Schools has provided $500,000 to the project and the State of Oregon $1 million for a combined total of $1.5 million.

In Portland, the concentration of disadvantaged children reside in the geographic area of the District served by eight elementary schools, one middle school, and one high school. These schools were formerly identified as "Sending" schools. Due to school service area configurations and the option of students to attend schools of their choice, some students residing in the target area attend middle schools outside the area served by these schools. In these cases, the concept of "money follows the child" is applied, and supplementary funds ordinarily available to support these students are distributed to these middle schools. These middle schools, formerly identified as "receiving" schools, do not qualify for ECIA Chapter 1 funds as do the Target Area schools, so the funds are used to provide services which are similar to Chapter 1 for Target Area students going to these middle schools. Project funds are used in different ways in the Target Area schools and the Qualifying Middle schools; therefore, program descriptions and achievement information will be reported separately for them under these new identifiers.

In addition to providing support for disadvantaged student in the Target Area schools and Qualifying Middle schools, the 1988-89 Project budget provided about 13 percent of the funding for Early Childhood Education (Head Start) and nearly all costs for the Whitney M. Young Learning Center program. Essentially all students participating in these programs reside in the area with a high concentration of disadvantaged students.

This evaluation report is divided into four major sections. The first section includes a brief, overall description of the programs which comprise the State Disadvantaged Child Project: (1) Target Area School programs; (2) Qualifying Middle school programs; and (3) special programs. Detailed program descriptions for individual schools are included in the project's proposal to the State. The second section summarizes achievement data compiled for grade 3 to 8 students in the Target Area and Qualifying Middle school programs. The third section includes budgetary information, and the final section is a brief summary.

SECTION I
DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAMS

Target Area School Programs

Eight elementary schools, one middle school, and one high school served the major portion of students who resided within the core of the District. Although all students who attend the Target Area schools may have benefitted from the Project, some benefitted more than others, depending on their needs and the services provided. The Target Area schools and the number of students in each grade are shown in Table 1. The total enrollment in these 10 schools at the beginning of October 1988 was 6,606, down slightly from 1987.

All Target Area schools also qualified and received support from the District's ECIA Chapter 1 projects, so qualifying students in these schools could have benefitted directly or indirectly from the two sources. Chapter 1 concentrates its efforts on basic skills development of the educationally disadvantaged; i.e., those performing at levels appreciably lower than their grade level peers. The number of Chapter 1 students served in each Target Area school is shown in Table 2. The Chapter 1 enrollment in these schools was 1,671.

Eight of the ten Target Area schools used funds for teachers. Three of them used additional full time teachers to reduce class sizes, and another used them for skill level groups in various subjects or special instructional arrangements. All Target Area schools used funds for instructional aides. Together with teachers and aides supported by Chapter 1 funds, this had the effect of dramatically increasing the opportunity for more instructor/student contact especially for students in greatest need.

TABLE 1

TOTAL STUDENT ENROLLMENT IN TARGET AREA SCHOOLS
OCTOBER 1988

SCHOOL	GRADE UN	PK	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	TOTAL
Boise/Eliot	25	110	131	128	105	90	97	104				790
Buckman	19		68	56	55	39	45	51				333
Humboldt		38	63	59	65	55	41	53				374
Irvington	7	76	116	88	70	72	79	91				599
King		109	145	123	98	101	89	98				763
Sabin	12	72	137	104	105	83	96	88				697
Tubman	22								248	198	202	670
Vernon		100	122	101	83	73	78	69				626
Woodlawn	24	61	98	76	67	72	61	61				520
Total	109	566	880	735	648	585	586	615	248	198	202	5,372

SCHOOL	GRADE UN	9	10	11	12	TOTAL
Jefferson	69	298	304	258	305	1,234

UN = Ungraded, Unassigned, or Unclassified
PK = Pre-Kindergarten

TABLE 2

CHAPTER 1 STUDENTS SERVED IN
TARGET AREA SCHOOLS DURING 1988

GRADE

School	UN	PK	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	TOTAL
Boise/Eliot				37	33	26	25	33				154
Buckman				24	19	13	20	17				93
Humboldt			1	42	32	48	24	33				180
Irvington					28	36	17	12				93
King		14		45	65	38	45	56				263
Sabin				36	40	32	44	22				174
Tubman									81	48	45	174
Vernon			39	25	48	31	31	16				190
Woodlawn				37	45	44	32	30				188
Total		14	40	246	310	258	238	219	81	48	45	1,509

School	UN	9	10	11	12	TOTAL
Jefferson		106	41	10	5	162

S = Special Education
PK = Pre-Kindergarten

Four schools, including the high school, employed community agents who served as liaison between the school and parents, sometimes linking them with community agencies. A major purpose was to stimulate parent involvement with schools which, traditionally, has not been extensive for parents of disadvantaged children. The community agent usually assisted with many after-school and off-campus activities including field trips arranged to enable disadvantaged children to share experiences which most non-disadvantaged children have. In addition to teachers, instructional aides, and community agents, a few schools each allocated funds for program enrichment (e.g., field trips, special assemblies), instructional systems and materials, and clerical/secretarial support.

At Jefferson High School, the State Disadvantaged Child Project complemented the school's Chapter 1 program which provided instruction in reading and math for low performing students. The Project provided support for smaller, skill level classes in English, social studies, health, other electives, and some math classes especially for students in grades nine and ten. Smaller classes were intended to provide greater attention to improving behavior such as increasing attendance, reducing disruptive behavior, and improving relationships with adults and peers.

Qualifying Middle School Programs

Three middle schools enrolled by a sufficient number of students from the target area to qualify for funds from the State Disadvantaged Child Project. The schools and the number of students in each grade served by the Project are shown in Table 3. Altogether, 160 students were served by the Project in the Qualifying Middle Schools. None of the schools met the socio-economic qualification for ECIA, Chapter 1 support; therefore, in these schools the funds were used in much the same manner as in the Chapter 1 schools and largely for students from the target area.

TABLE 3
QUALIFYING MIDDLE SCHOOL PROGRAM, 1988-89

SCHOOL	GRADE 6	7	8	TOTAL
Beaumont	6	23	32	61
Binnsmead	0	0	49	49
Fernwood	25	11	14	50
Total	31	34	95	160

The selection of students for programs in the Qualifying Middle Schools was based on the students residing in the target area. Lower performing students received from schools in this area comprised the key population; however, some other students received services for reasons other than their academic achievement, e.g., role models, sustaining performances. Students in the State Disadvantaged Child Project were expected to be disadvantaged students whose achievement scores in one or more of the basic skill areas of reading, math, or language usage was below grade level (P-score less than 43).

There were two arrangements for providing supplementary instruction for targeted students. In one school, students received supplementary instruction from a teacher and a general fund aide in a separate setting. In the other two, aides teamed with teachers in basic skills classes and provided extra instructional support to selected students in-class. One school also had an At-Risk Counselor who provided support to teacher, students, and parents by communication link between the school and affected families. She worked with regular school counselors and frequently made phone calls and home visits in dealing with student attendance and other problems.

Special Programs

The special programs which received partial support for their total program budget for the State Disadvantaged Child Project included Early Childhood Education (Head Start) and the Whitney M. Young Learning Center. Each program was unique and served a different population of students.

Early Childhood Education (Head Start) -- Instruction for the Early Childhood Education program, often referred to as the Headstart Program, was provided by funds from the Department of Health and Human Services Administration for Children, Youth, and Families. The State Disadvantaged Child Project provided partial support for an administrator, speech pathologist, psychological services, food and nutrition services, and full support for a Community Agent. A number of other medical, social and personal services were provided by other sources.

A little over 300 students were served in comprehensive preschool programs located at Sacajawea (six classrooms) and Lents (three classrooms) schools. Seventeen students were enrolled in each classroom for half-day sessions

making a total of 18 classes held each day. Regulations require that a minimum of ten percent of the students be classified as handicapped and each year more than ten percent are so classified.

The purpose of preschool instruction was to strengthen language, personal/social, and cognitive skills of disadvantaged children to enable them to succeed subsequently in regular school programs. The curriculum covered nine subject areas: emotional development, social development, language development, cognitive development, large motor development, small motor development, numerical concepts, art, and music. Classroom activities were arranged to alternate between large and small group activities.

Parent involvement was especially encouraged, recognizing that parents are a strong influence on the educational outcomes of their children. Teachers made time to work with parents, and home visits were made three times during the school year. Headstart has a special parent room and provided parent training in child care and learning. More information about the program is in the annual report prepared by the Department of Health and Human Services which conducts the evaluation of Head Start programs.

Whitney M. Young Learning Center -- The Whitney M. Young Learning Center (WMYLC) was started in 1980 by the Urban League and has been in operation since that time. It is located at the St. Andrews Community Center and largely serves students residing in the area served by Jefferson and Grant High Schools. The short-term purpose of the Center was to provide after school homework and tutoring assistance on a voluntary basis mainly for students in grades 7 to 12. A longer term purpose was to revitalize learning for students and residents in Northeast Portland by extending the hours of attention to learning not only through homework and tutoring assistance, but by other activities conducted a t the Center. Simultaneously, WMYLC provided a comfortable, secure and socially acceptable environment for students where such and environment was seen as needed. WMYLC was staffed by a full-time director, part-time assistant director, a part-time assistant, and three part-time certified teachers who operated the program Monday through Thursday from 3:00 to 8:00 p.m. during the regular school year. The quality of services was enhanced by volunteers, many of whom were professionals who provided excellent role models.

As indicated above, WMYLC arranged and conducted other activities which extended student learning. For example, students made contributions to the newsletter, heard speakers, participated in contests, and held forums where topics of interest were discussed. In this way, students remained productively engaged beyond the time it took them to complete their homework or to be tutored.

SECTION II
ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE PROJECT

The achievements of the State Disadvantaged Child Project are presented in terms of the programs which comprise the Project. This section is divided according to the programs described in Section I.

Target Area School Programs

In general, all students in the Target Area schools were assumed to benefit from the services provided through the State Disadvantaged Child Project. One evaluation compares the performances of the students enrolled in the Target Area schools with those of District students in each grade -- the latter group viewed as a normative population. The Target Area schools also had Chapter 1 programs which served students who meet the qualifications for supplementary services in basic skills instruction. The second evaluation compares the performances of Chapter 1 students in these schools with those of Chapter 1 students in the District.

Comparable achievement data across the Target Area schools were obtained from the Districtwide testing program which uses the Portland Achievement Levels Tests in reading, math, and language usage for grades 3 to 8. In interpreting these results, it should be noted that eight of the ten Target schools enrolled students in grades up to 5; and one more enrolled students in grades 6 to 8. Therefore, the data are representative of Target Area students in grades 3 to 5 but not necessarily representative of students in grades 6 to 8 who reside in the core area. Table 1, presented earlier, shows a considerably smaller number of students in each of grades 6 to 8 than in each of the lower grades. This discrepancy indicates that many students of middle school age who resided in the core area did not attend the Target Area middle school.

All achievement results in this report for 1988-89 were based on students who had both Fall and Spring test scores (clear group) in a given subject, and who were also enrolled in the same school for the entire school year (intact); therefore, the numbers of students for whom results were reported, were less than the official numbers of students found in the October Enrollment Reports each year.

Achievement test results, in terms of RIT[1] scores, for the Target Area schools and for the total district are shown in Table 4. The results show that the Fall and Spring scores of the Target Area students were lower than those of the district in all grades and in all subjects. This finding, of course, is not unexpected, and is the reason for supplementary support for these schools. In grades 3 to 5 the Fall and Spring scores tended to be about 4.0 RIT points lower in each subject. For the middle school, RIT scores for reading tended to be about 8.0 points lower than the District average for grade 6 and about 3.5 points lower for grades 7 and 8. In math, the RIT scores ranged from about 4.0 to 7.0 points lower.

In comparing the Fall-to-Spring gains of the Target Area schools with the average gains of the district, the results show that the gains of the Target Area students in grades 3 to 5 were usually as large or larger in reading and language usage, but a little smaller in math. In the middle school, the gains were smaller than the averages of the district in all grades in reading and smaller for only grade 6 in math; gains in language usage were larger than those of the district in all grades.

All Target Area Schools also have Chapter 1 in programs in reading and math, and it seemed reasonable to examine the achievements of Chapter 1 students in these schools separately. Table 5 contains results for Chapter 1 students in the Target Area schools, District Chapter 1 students, and project students in the qualifying middle schools. Each group was expected to be somewhat comparable in terms of academic achievement, because students were selected for participation based on similar criteria.

In grades 3 to 5, the achievement gains of the Target Area school Chapter 1 students were smaller than those of the district Chapter 1 with the exception of grade 5 reading and grade 4 math. In grades 6 to 8, the gains of the Chapter 1 Target Area middle school were smaller than district Chapter 1 in reading, but larger in math in all grades.

---

1 RIT scores are equal interval scale scores derived by a special calibration technique commonly referred to as the "Rasch Model." The valid score range of the current tests is about 140 to 270.

TABLE 4

ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS FOR TARGET AREA SCHOOLS AND TOTAL DISTRICT, 1988-89

		READING RIT				MATH RIT				LANGUAGE USAGE RIT			
GRADE	GROUP	N	FALL	SPRING	GAIN	N	FALL	SPRING	GAIN	N	FALL	SPRING	GAIN
3	Target	457	186.20	194.20	8.00	468	184.20	197.80	13.60	449	185.80	196.20	10.40
	District	3,348	191.40	199.20	7.80	3,411	188.30	201.20	12.90	3,344	190.00	200.10	10.10
4	Target	482	195.80	201.40	5.60	483	196.40	204.90	8.50	487	194.20	202.10	7.90
	District	3,532	199.50	205.60	6.10	3,553	199.70	208.70	9.00	3,544	199.10	206.40	7.30
5	Target	532	200.50	206.50	6.00	532	203.40	211.20	7.80	530	200.70	207.80	7.10
	District	3,474	206.30	211.70	5.40	3,485	207.90	216.40	8.50	3,477	205.50	212.10	6.60
6	Target[1]	193	203.54	207.72	4.18	206	205.97	212.82	6.85	203	203.40	209.12	5.72
	District	3,222	211.60	216.10	4.50	3,247	212.70	220.30	7.60	3,221	210.30	215.30	5.00
7	Target	160	212.66	215.56	2.90	168	212.94	219.29	6.35	169	210.82	215.93	5.11
	District	3,035	216.10	220.20	4.10	3,063	219.90	226.20	6.30	3,034	214.60	219.50	4.90
8	Target	167	217.87	220.27	2.40	177	219.00	225.16	6.16	177	213.33	218.96	5.63
	District	3,046	221.20	224.90	3.70	3,073	226.60	232.30	3.70	3,052	219.50	223.50	4.00

[1] Only one Target Area school had students in grades 6 to 8 resulting in the smaller N in these grades.

TABLE 5

ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS FOR CHAPTER 1 STUDENTS IN TARGET AREA SCHOOLS, DISTRICT CHAPTER 1, AND QUALIFYING MIDDLE SCHOOLS, 1988-89

		READING RIT				MATH RIT			
GRADE	GROUP	N	FALL	SPRING	GAIN	N	FALL	SPRING	GAIN
3	Target Ch-1	144	172.40	182.00	9.60	148	175.20	190.00	14.80
	District Ch-1	555	174.28	184.48	10.20	388	174.61	189.69	15.08
4	Target Ch-1	137	182.80	190.00	7.20	123	186.20	195.80	9.60
	District Ch-1	487	182.30	189.88	7.58	438	186.92	195.61	8.69
5	Target Ch-1	149	187.30	195.10	7.70	118	192.30	199.90	7.60
	District Ch-1	437	188.74	195.55	6.81	383	194.05	202.25	8.20
6[1]	Target Ch-1	42	190.12	195.00	4.88	47	196.83	203.38	6.55
	District Ch-1	291	192.08	197.59	5.51	297	197.87	203.86	5.99
	Qualifying	29	193.75	194.51	0.76	25	198.20	205.08	6.88
7	Target Ch-1	24	194.08	200.58	6.50	22	199.82	205.59	5.77
	District Ch-1	242	195.95	202.75	6.80	261	203.71	209.26	5.55
	Qualifying	30	202.36	205.13	2.77	12	204.25	208.16	3.91
8	Target Ch-1	20	201.50	202.60	1.10	26	204.73	212.65	7.92
	District Ch-1	232	203.01	207.77	4.76	232	208.31	214.22	5.91
	Qualifying	33	206.96	210.21	3.25	41	211.51	216.65	5.14

[1] Only one Target Area school had students in grades 6 to 8 resulting in small N for these grades.

Results compiled for a school or student group for a given year are often difficult to interpret. Rarely is there a rationale with predetermined expectations to account for the results; therefore, interpretations are post hoc and are often controversial. By examining results accumulated over successive years, it is often possible to observe patterns in the performances of smaller groups which are not apparent when results are examined year by year. Data for the State Disadvantaged Child Project were accumulated and compiled for seven years. This volume of data is considered sufficient that consistencies, or inconsistencies, observed over several years should have some significance. In the analyses which follow, annual Fall-to-Spring achievement gain scores of students from the PALT were obtained for all district students, students in Target Area schools, district Chapter 1 students, and Chapter 1 students in the Target Area schools, and comparisons across these groups are made. Again, results include only students in grades 3 through 8 for whom achievement test scores were available.

The first analysis compared the achievement gains of all students in the Target Area schools with those of the district which may be considered the norming population. Table 6 shows that with six grades and seven years of results, 42 comparison were possible for each of the three subject areas of reading, math, and language usage. Results for reading showed that the gains of the Target Area students were equal to, or larger than, those of the district 20 of 42 times (48 percent). This finding is interpreted to indicate that the annual reading gains of the Target Area schools were about the same as those of the district each year.

In math, the gains of the Target Area students were larger than those of the district only 9 of 42 times (21 percent). This difference tested by the sign test for paired observations was statistically significant beyond the .01 level. The finding is interpreted to indicate that the gains of the Target Area schools in math were smaller than those of the district each year.

The results for language usage were like those for reading; the gains of the Target Area students were equal to or larger than those of the district 20 of 42 times (48 percent). This finding is interpreted to indicate that the annual gains of the Target Area students in language usage were the same as those of the district each year.

TABLE 6

FALL TO SPRING GAINS OF THE TOTAL DISTRICT AND TARGET AREA SCHOOLS IN READING, MATH, AND LANGUAGE USAGE, 1982-83 TO 1988-89

		TOTAL DISTRICT			TARGET AREA SCHOOLS		
GRADE	YEAR	READING	MATH	LANGUAGE	READING	MATH	LANGUAGE
3	1982-83	6.28	9.35	2.40	7.13	9.02	1.88
	1983-84	8.38	11.76	5.76	7.86	11.75	4.68
	1984-85	5.83	10.82	3.33	6.39	9.94	2.54
	1985-86	5.63	11.55	3.81	6.05	10.82	2.85
	1986-87	5.30	11.89	3.78	5.18	11.56	2.76
	1987-88	7.94	12.69	9.63	8.20	12.70	10.00
	1988-89	7.80	12.90	10.10	8.00	13.60	10.40
4	1982-83	6.29	7.81	5.57	5.57	7.83	5.35
	1983-84	8.53	9.76	8.32	8.97	8.96	8.79
	1984-85	6.55	8.51	5.64	6.31	8.38	5.76
	1985-86	6.75	8.33	7.23	7.50	8.55	8.18
	1986-87	5.95	8.79	7.44	5.94	7.61	7.86
	1987-88	7.69	9.21	7.94	8.20	10.20	8.80
	1988-89	6.10	9.00	7.30	5.60	8.50	7.90
5	1982-83	6.00	5.56	5.59	5.27	4.64	4.32
	1983-84	7.63	7.70	7.60	7.12	7.54	7.59
	1984-85	6.14	6.40	5.89	6.05	4.97	5.13
	1985-86	4.80	7.00	5.33	6.01	6.56	6.21
	1986-87	4.10	7.53	5.21	3.85	6.70	5.60
	1987-88	6.11	7.99	6.04	6.80	7.20	6.00
	1988-89	5.40	8.50	6.60	6.00	7.80	7.10
6	1982-83	5.41	6.73	5.65	3.86	6.30	5.69
	1983-84	6.43	8.41	6.60	6.84	7.17	6.10
	1984-85	4.78	7.43	5.69	4.79	6.39	5.42
	1985-86	4.57	7.09	5.05	4.02	5.48	4.74
	1986-87	4.45	7.34	4.67	5.80	7.07	5.40
	1987-88	5.68	8.10	5.12	5.30	6.84	4.49
	1988-89	4.50	7.60	5.00	4.18	6.85	5.72
7	1982-83	4.25	6.54	5.73	3.40	5.01	5.02
	1983-84	5.25	7.61	6.77	4.48	6.61	5.72
	1984-85	4.89	6.74	6.60	5.89	4.57	5.38
	1985-86	4.04	5.59	3.62	2.49	4.81	2.98
	1986-87	3.89	5.91	3.59	4.86	6.29	4.59
	1987-88	4.70	6.60	3.97	4.17	5.24	4.13
	1988-89	4.10	6.30	4.90	2.90	6.35	5.11
8	1982-83	3.90	6.28	6.35	3.07	5.16	5.37
	1983-84	5.29	7.37	7.47	5.56	5.06	5.43
	1984-85	4.38	6.31	7.14	3.38	5.18	5.96
	1985-86	3.49	4.23	3.46	4.03	3.85	2.53
	1986-87	3.29	4.60	3.14	3.32	4.67	3.48
	1987-88	4.28	5.55	3.48	4.50	4.72	3.16
	1988-89	3.70	3.70	4.00	2.40	6.16	5.63

A second analysis compared the reading and math achievement gains of Chapter 1 students in the Target Area schools with those of all district Chapter 1 students. Again, with six grades and seven years of results, 42 comparisons were possible for each of the two subjects. Results in Table 7 show that in reading the gains of the Target Area Chapter 1 students were larger than those of the district Chapter 1 students 15 of 42 times (36 percent). Results for math show that the gains of the Target Area Chapter 1 students were larger only 10 of 42 times (24 percent). The difference for reading tested by the sign test for paired observations just missed ($p = .07$) being significant at the .05 level; the difference for math was significant beyond the .01 level. These findings are interpreted to indicate that the gains of the Target Area Chapter 1 students in reading were nearly as large as those of district Chapter 1 students, but in math they were smaller.

The third analysis compared the gains of Chapter 1 students in the Target Area schools with the gains for all students in the Target Area schools. This analysis indicates relative gains which may be attributable to Chapter 1 and non-Chapter 1 programs. For example, a small Chapter 1 gain compared to a rather large gain for all students in the Target Area schools could indicate that the non-Chapter 1 programs were stronger. Results for reading showed that the gains of the Chapter 1 students were larger than those for all students in the Target Area schools 32 of 42 times (76 percent). This difference for reading tested by sign test is significant beyond the .01 level. Results for math show that the gains of Chapter 1 students were larger than those for all students in the Target Area schools 23 of 42 times (55 percent). This difference for math is not significant.

When the gains of Chapter 1 students and gains for all students in the Target Area schools were compared by grade levels, those for Chapter 1 students in grades 3 to 5 were larger than those for all students in the Target Area schools in both reading and math much more frequently than they were smaller. This finding is interpreted to indicate that the Chapter 1 programs in these schools were contributing positively to the overall average gains in the Target Area schools. In the middle school grades, math appears as an area in need of improvement especially for the Target Area school Chapter 1 program, i.e., the Chapter 1 math gains were more frequently smaller than those of the whole school and, therefore, held down the overall average gains of the school.

TABLE 7

FALL TO SPRING GAINS OF CHAPTER 1 STUDENTS IN THE DISTRICT AND TARGET AREA SCHOOLS IN READING AND MATH, 1982-83 TO 1988-89

GRADE	YEAR	TOTAL DISTRICT READING	TOTAL DISTRICT MATH	TARGET AREA SCHOOLS READING	TARGET AREA SCHOOLS MATH
3	1982-83	9.08	10.01	8.26	9.77
	1983-84	11.18	12.11	9.27	11.07
	1984-85	8.76	10.65	10.82	10.69
	1985-86	8.42	14.75	8.82	14.44
	1986-87	7.37	13.30	6.72	12.27
	1987-88	8.19	13.87	8.60	13.10
	1988-89	10.20	15.08	9.60	14.80
4	1982-83	6.63	6.62	6.08	6.38
	1983-84	9.00	9.73	8.95	9.42
	1984-85	7.30	9.44	7.70	7.75
	1985-86	7.66	9.74	8.33	9.33
	1986-87	7.08	9.12	7.08	9.00
	1987-88	9.10	10.25	8.60	10.70
	1988-89	7.58	8.69	7.20	9.60
5	1982-83	6.32	6.28	4.46	6.18
	1983-84	8.67	8.91	8.52	8.12
	1984-85	7.34	7.01	7.20	6.19
	1985-86	6.95	7.76	7.50	7.99
	1986-87	4.01	6.21	5.00	6.10
	1987-88	7.30	7.57	6.90	7.00
	1988-89	6.81	8.25	7.70	7.60
6	1982-83	5.36	6.07	3.55	5.25
	1983-84	7.71	8.64	8.09	7.48
	1984-85	4.93	7.70	4.37	4.48
	1985-86	6.56	7.67	5.31	7.45
	1986-87	6.34	6.43	6.96	8.76
	1987-88	6.74	6.48	6.11	4.41
	1988-89	5.51	5.99	4.88	6.55
7	1982-83	5.35	6.11	2.96	3.39
	1983-84	6.23	7.17	3.96	3.36
	1984-85	6.40	7.57	8.00	3.73
	1985-86	5.69	6.11	1.21	5.00
	1986-87	4.78	4.79	5.12	4.21
	1987-88	6.03	6.27	3.95	4.42
	1988-89	6.80	5.55	6.50	5.77
8	1982-83	4.61	5.28	2.80	4.45
	1983-84	7.09	5.91	9.35	9.00
	1984-85	6.48	7.63	1.68	3.82
	1985-86	6.07	6.53	5.90	3.45
	1986-87	4.53	5.00	4.65	5.70
	1987-88	6.32	5.89	5.50	0.55
	1988-89	4.76	5.91	1.10	7.92

In general, the longitudinal data are interpreted to indicate that Target Area schools made annual achievement gains that were about equal to those of the district in reading and language usage, but they were smaller in math. Chapter 1 students in the Target Area schools also made smaller gains than their counterparts in the district in math; their gains in reading also tended to be smaller.

One Target Area school devoted effort to a special group of 41 students. These were students who were not served by a special program, e.g., Chapter 1, ESL, ERC, Indian Education Project, but a teacher and a part-time paraprofessional provided additional support in one or more subject area depending on the student's needs. Due to a variety of circumstances including the small number of students and the kind of instruction they received, the results of achievement test scores were difficult to interpret. The difficulty should not discourage the school from continuing its special efforts. A sound rationale for the program and results accumulated over several years could be revealing.

Jefferson High School is identified as a Target Area school; its service area includes the areas served by the other Target Area elementary and middle schools. At Jefferson High School, Project funds enable the school to offer smaller skill level classes in English, social studies, health, other electives, and some math classes. A significant feature was the improvement of student behavior in school, as mentioned earlier. Many students in these classes were also enrolled in the school's Chapter 1 reading and/or math programs, so scores for these students were examined for any overall impact that might be detected.

The Jefferson Chapter 1 program used the Stanford Diagnostic test for reading and the PALT for math; therefore, Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE) scores were used so comparisons with District Chapter 1 could be made (NCE) scores are standard scores which have a mean of 50 and standard deviations of 21.06). The results are shown in Table 8.

TABLE 8

Reading and Math NCE Scores for
Jefferson High School and District Chapter 1 Programs

Reading

Grade	Jefferson Chapter 1 N	Fall	Spring	Gain	District Chapter 1 N	Fall	Spring	Gain
9	47	17.71	24.20	6.49	204	22.71	31.25	8.54
10	12	7.64	21.29	13.65	53	16.66	24.05	7.39
11	4	5.70	8.76	3.06	42	19.00	18.29	-0.71
12	3	1.00	4.13	3.13	40	22.74	26.12	3.38

Math

Grade	Jefferson Chapter 1 N	Fall	Spring	Gain	District Chapter 1 N	Fall	Spring	Gain
9	39	12.76	21.05	8.29	192	23.35	30.57	7.22
10	8	1.00	1.52	0.52	31	18.43	19.03	0.60
11	1	15.44	16.29	0.85	14	21.74	27.60	5.86
12	0	--	--	--	6	26.92	31.12	4.20

High School Chapter 1 students are highly mobile, and it is sometimes difficult to obtain matched Fall and Spring scores for a large number of these students; therefore, the data are not representative of all Chapter 1 students served during the school year, but they adequately represent those who were enrolled for the full school year. Due to the small numbers of students, especially in the upper grades and the fact that students are often grouped across grades for instructional purposes, the data were pooled across grades and results interpreted for the groups as a whole.

The results (not shown) based on combined grades showed that the average gain for the Jefferson Chapter 1 students in reading was 7.43 NCE, and the gain for the District Chapter 1 was 6.61 NCE. In math, the gain for the Jefferson Chapter 1 students was 6.84 NCE, while that for the District Chapter 1 was 6.22 NCE. Thus, Jefferson Chapter 1 students made slightly larger gains than the average for all Chapter 1 students in both subjects.

Qualifying Middle School Programs

Table 3 showed a total of 160 students in grades 6 to 8 were identified as State Disadvantage Child Project students in the three Qualifying Middle

schools. The numbers of students in each school and in each grade were too small for reasonable interpretations for grades within schools, so data were pooled across the schools for analysis. The results are included in Table 5 along with those for Chapter 1 students in the Target Area schools and District Chapter 1 students. The scores for students were included only if they received supplementary instruction in the given subject.

In general, the Fall and Spring scores of Project students in the Qualifying Middle schools tended to be a little higher than those of the District and Target area Chapter 1 students. Project students were generally selected by using Chapter 1 criteria with priority given to transfer students. In reading, the gains of the Qualifying Middle school students were smaller than those of Chapter 1 students in all grades. In math, the gain was larger for grade 6, but they were smaller for grades 7 and 8. Chapter 1 does not have language usage programs, so data for this subject were not included. These results show that the Project students in the Qualifying Middle Schools did not achieve as well as comparable students in Chapter 1 programs.

Instructional programs as provided by the three Qualifying Middle schools have been fairly consistent over the last three years, so data accumulated for these years were used in interpreting results for the schools. Data for the District Chapter 1 program were also used for comparison as shown in Table 9.

TABLE 9

THREE YEAR ACHIEVEMENT DATA

READING: LONGITUDINAL DATA FOR DISTRICT CHAPTER 1 AND QUALIFYING SCHOOLS

		DISTRICT CHAPTER 1				QUALIFYING SCHOOLS			
GRADE	YEAR	N	FALL	SPRING	GAIN	N	FALL	SPRING	GAIN
6	1986-87	367	193.63	199.97	6.34	29	199.66	203.28	3.62
	1987-88	312	195.69	202.43	6.74	56	196.00	203.73	7.73
	1988-89	291	192.08	197.59	5.51	29	193.75	194.51	0.76
7	1986-87	302	198.84	203.62	4.78	60	203.78	210.10	6.32
	1987-88	298	199.39	205.42	6.03	34	202.71	209.29	6.58
	1988-89	242	195.95	202.75	6.80	30	202.36	205.13	2.77
8	1986-87	289	202.70	207.23	4.53	48	209.50	213.73	4.23
	1987-88	251	202.63	208.95	6.32	52	205.71	211.00	5.29
	1988-89	232	203.01	207.77	4.76	33	206.96	210.21	3.25

MATHEMATICS: LONGITUDINAL DATA FOR DISTRICT CHAPTER 1 AND QUALIFYING SCHOOLS

		DISTRICT CHAPTER 1				QUALIFYING SCHOOLS			
GRADE	YEAR	N	FALL	SPRING	GAIN	N	FALL	SPRING	GAIN
6*	1986-87	310	199.36	205.79	6.43	28	200.64	204.54	3.90
	1987-88	303	198.08	204.56	6.48	50	200.20	205.24	5.04
	1988-89	297	197.87	203.86	5.99	25	198.20	205.08	6.88
7	1986-87	306	204.61	209.40	4.79	63	208.08	213.54	5.46
	1987-88	275	203.15	209.42	6.27	22	207.86	212.86	5.00
	1988-89	261	203.71	209.26	5.55	12	204.25	208.16	3.91
8	1986-87	288	208.92	213.92	5.00	49	213.10	217.98	4.88
	1987-88	226	208.02	213.91	5.89	25	207.64	214.12	6.48
	1988-89	232	208.31	214.22	5.91	41	211.51	216.65	5.14

The results in Table 9 show that the Fall RIT scores for Project students served in the Qualifying Middle schools tended to be a little higher than those served in the District Chapter 1 program. The differences, however, were not large enough to make overall comparisons of gains unreasonable. With three grades over three years and two subjects, there were 18 possible comparisons. Of the 18 comparisons, the RIT gains of the Qualifying Middle schools were larger than the average Chapter 1 gains 6 times, only one of which was for the 1988-89 school year. In general, reading and math gains for the Qualifying Middle schools may be considered as comparable to those for Chapter 1 students.

Achievements of the Project students were examined in relation to estimates of those for their peers in the Qualifying Middle schools over the last three years. In reading, average RIT gains of all students in the Qualifying Middle schools (these data are not shown) were about 4.5 for grade 6, 4.25 for grade 7, and about 3.75 for grade 8. Except for the 1988-89 school year when the reading gains of the Project students in the Qualifying Middle schools were noticeably smaller than those of previous years and smaller than those of their peers, Project student gains were more frequently larger than those of averages for the schools. In math, average RIT gains of all students in the Qualifying Middle schools were about 7.5 for grade 6, about 6.6 for grade 7 and about 5.0 for grade 8. Except for grade 8, the RIT gains of the Project students in math were more frequently smaller than the average gains of all students in the qualifying schools.

The different results for reading and math and differences across grade levels and from year to year tend to indicate that the Project students in the Qualifying Middle schools were not consistently making larger than average gains.

Special Programs

Early Childhood Education (Head Start) -- Most of the funds (87 percent) for the Head Start programs came from the Department of Health and Human Services Administration for Children, Youth, and Families, and evaluations were conducted jointly by the Region X Office and the schools. The program prepared its own self-evaluation according to Federal guidelines, and each year, the Region X Office makes visits for observations and reviews. The evaluations included compliances with various, and numerous, administrative requirements as well as student demographic and performance data.

Each year a total of about 350 students are served and 1988-89 was no exception. Established requirements for numbers of handicapped students and numbers above the accepted poverty level must be met. About 50 percent of the students were African American, 30 percent European American, and the remaining 20 percent were largely Asian American.

Nearly all students received medical and/or dental services during the year, and all immunizations were completed for those who needed them. During the year, students were screened to determine any handicapping conditions.

Whitney M. Young Learning Center (WMYLC) -- Due to the nature of the WMYLC program, the evaluation is accomplished by a description of the services provided, tabulations of the extent of student participation, and general summary of student impressions. Information in WMYLC's year-end report for 1988-89 was summarized according to three categories.

WMYLC was open Monday through Thursday, from 3:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. during the school year. The Center staff consisted of a full-time director, a program assistant/tutor, two part-time professional tutors, and a small pool of volunteer tutors. The major activities were one-on-one tutoring, homework assistance, and independent homework. The Center had a computer, and students were free to use it. In addition to the tutoring and homework activities, the staff and students arranged and conducted a number of other activities, e.g., guest speakers, production of a newsletter, rap sessions on selected topics. Staff members were alert to many activities being sponsored in the community, and students were encouraged to participate.

One hundred fifty eight students visited the Center during the 1988-89 school year. Demographic information indicated that nearly all students were African-American (92 percent) with a handful of other ethnic groups represented. They were about equally divided among males and females, and about half were high school students with all but one high school represented. More than half resided with a single parent, nearly always the mother. The number who visited during the year were noticeably lower than the number who visited the previous year (N = 230) and lower than the estimated number of 200 expected to be served according to the contract. The smaller number of participants was attributed partly to the lower enrollment at Jefferson High School from which the largest number of WMYLC participants came, and, perhaps more to drug and gang activity in the area surrounding WMYLC.

A total of 2,058 student visits were recorded, an average of 13 visits per student over the school year. The staff recorded a total of 4,208 student hours spent in tutoring alone (it should be noted that every student did not seek tutoring on every visit).

A student survey was conducted near the end of the school year. Fifty-seven surveys were distributed and 52 (91 percent) were returned. In response to open-ended questions, a wide majority of the students indicate the main reason for their visit to the Center was to get help with their school work and to get homework done without distractions, e.g., a quiet place to study. Although many reported they visited the Center voluntarily, a large number apparently received encouragement from their mothers.

Comments by students to four other questions about WMYLC were nearly always positive with most negative comments apparently made in jest. Several comments made about how students conducted themselves indicated clearly that most students visited the center with serious intent, e.g., learn, do homework, get help, and they were quite intolerant of occasions when there were distractions and other disruptive behavior, e.g., loud and boisterous behavior, lack of discipline.

In general, it appeared that students were satisfied with the services and the atmosphere provided by WMYLC. It was unfortunate that the number of students was less than the number expected. The number of students and student visits are important considerations in relation to costs and should be monitored.

SECTION III
PROGRAM BUDGET

The distribution of the total budget for schools and programs is shown in Table 7. Of the total budget, 76.9 percent was allocated to the Target Area schools, 8.0 percent to the receiving schools, and 15.2 percent to the special programs and other support services. Based on the allocations to the schools, the average cost per project student in the Target Area schools, which includes all students attending these schools, was about $175. The average cost per project student in the Qualifying schools was about $750.

TABLE 12

EXPENDITURES OF STATE DISADVANTAGED CHILD PROJECT
1987-88

	Expenditures	
TARGET AREA SCHOOLS		
Boise/Eliot	$ 117,120	
Buckman	52,050	
Humboldt	117,600	
Irvington	74,800	
Jefferson	192,038	
King	163,060	
Sabin	88,329	
Tubman	120,304	
Vernon	118,080	
Woodlawn	109,440	1,152,821
QUALIFYING SCHOOLS		
Beaumont	$ 55,395	
Binnsmead	20,000	
Fernwood	44,474	119,869
SPECIAL PROGRAMS/SERVICES		
Early Childhood Education	$ 111,566	
Whitney M. Young Learning Center	74,000	
Evaluation	19,400	
Grants Management	22,344	227,310
TOTAL		$1,500,000

SECTION IV
SUMMARY AND COMMENTS

The State Disadvantaged Child Project consisted of three major components: Target Area schools, Qualifying Middle schools, and special programs. The major component, Target Area schools, served nearly 6,600 student in 10 schools located in the Portland core area. Project funds in these schools were used mostly to provide additional teachers and teacher assistants to increase teacher-to-student ratios and to enrich the school curricula especially using computers. In some schools, the Project served lower performing students who did not qualify for the school's Chapter 1 program. Although the project was expected to impact schools in various ways including basic skills, only achievement test results in reading, math, and language usage for students in grades 3 through 12 were compiled to evaluate the impact of the project in these schools.

A much smaller component, Qualifying Middle schools, served 160 students who were mostly from the target area and who also met the requirements for services provided by the project. The services were largely supplementary instruction in the basic skills similar to that of programs in the Chapter 1 schools. Achievement test results were compiled to evaluate the impact of the project in these schools.

The third component consisted of partial support for two special programs which served students, most of whom were also from the Portland Core area. A brief summary of their achievements which were documented elsewhere was included in this report.

Altogether, 7,000 students were served to some degree by the State Disadvantaged Child Project. Some received more direct services that others. The purpose of this report is to describe the various programs that comprise the Project and, to the extent possible, to document the ways in which students benefitted.

Except, perhaps, for funds allocated to Qualifying Middle schools, there were no specific, identifiable student outcomes associated with the school or program's use of funds provided by the State Disadvantaged Child Project. these funds were essentially a supplement to the school or program's total budget and the benefits were shared by all students. Thus, only information reflecting the achievements of all, or significant segment, of the school or program's total population was included in this report.

146E